

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF TOXIC)	
SUBSTANCES CONTROL,)	2:02-cv-00018-GEB-GGH
)	
Plaintiff,)	
)	<u>ORDER APPROVING CONSENT</u>
v.)	<u>DECREE, BARRING CONTRIBUTION</u>
)	<u>CLAIMS, AND FINDING CONSENT</u>
CHARLES V. KESTER, ET AL.,)	<u>DECREE WAS REACHED IN GOOD</u>
)	<u>FAITH</u>
Defendants.)	
)	
_____)	
)	
AND RELATED CROSS-CLAIMS,)	
COUNTERCLAIMS, and THIRD-PARTY)	
ACTIONS)	
_____)	

Plaintiff California Department of Toxic Substances Control (the "Department") moves for approval of the proposed Consent Decree (the "Sullivan Consent Decree") into which it entered with John L. Sullivan Chevrolet, Inc. ("Sullivan"), Gordon Turner Motors ("Turner"), the California Department of Transportation, the California Department of General Services, the California Department of Fish and Game, the California National Guard, and the California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection (the "State Agencies"). (ECF No. 1215.) The Sullivan Consent Decree was filed on May 4, 2011 as Docket Number 1219. Sullivan, Turner, and the State Agencies (collectively, the "settling parties") also seek a judicial declaration under California Code of Civil Procedure section 877.6 that the Sullivan Consent Decree is made in good faith, and an order issued under 42 U.S.C. § 9613(f) which would bar

1 contribution or indemnity claims against the settling parties for the
2 "matters addressed" in the Sullivan Consent Decree. (ECF No. 1214.)

3 **I. BACKGROUND**

4 This is a cost recovery action brought by the Department under
5 the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation and Liability Act
6 ("CERCLA"), prescribed in 42 U.S.C. §§ 9601 *et seq.*. The Department
7 seeks to recover the response costs it has incurred and will incur
8 monitoring, assessing, and evaluating the alleged release and threatened
9 release of hazardous substances from a tract of land located at the
10 intersection of White Rock and Kilgore Roads in Rancho Cordova,
11 California (the "Site"). The Department also seeks to recover the costs
12 it has incurred and will incur removing, remediating, and overseeing the
13 removal and remediation of hazardous substances at the Site.

14 Following a settlement conference with United States
15 Magistrate Judge Hollows on May 29, 2009, the Department and twenty nine
16 parties reached a settlement and entered into a proposed consent decree
17 which the district court subsequently approved (the "2010 Consent
18 Decree"). (ECF Nos. 1102, 1120.) The Department then filed a Fourth
19 Amended Complaint (the "Complaint"), naming as defendants Sullivan,
20 Turner, and other parties who were not a party to the 2010 Consent
21 Decree. (Complaint ¶¶ 63-67, ECF No. 1145.) Sullivan and Turner each
22 filed a counterclaim against the State Agencies, who are signatories to
23 the Sullivan Consent Decree. (ECF Nos. 1163-64.) This pending litigation
24 was referred to the Voluntary Dispute Resolution Program for mediation
25 on October 27, 2010. (ECF No. 1178.) "On March 3, 2011 the parties to
26 this Consent Decree participated in a mediation through the Court's
27 Voluntary Dispute Resolution Program, and reached a settlement in

1 principle." (Decl. of Fiering ¶ 4, ECF No. 1217.) The Sullivan Consent
2 Decree "memorializes that settlement agreement." Id.

3 **II. MOTION FOR APPROVAL OF SULLIVAN CONSENT DECREE**

4 Here, the decision whether the Sullivan Consent Decree is
5 approved requires the "court [to] be satisfied that [the Sullivan
6 Consent Decree] is at least fundamentally fair, adequate and
7 reasonable." U.S. v. State of Oregon, 913 F.2d 576, 580 (9th Cir. 1990).
8 "[F]airness in the CERCLA settlement context has both procedural and
9 substantive components. To measure procedural fairness, a court should
10 ordinarily look to the negotiation process and attempt to gauge its
11 candor, openness, and bargaining balance." U.S. v. Cannons Eng'g Corp.,
12 899 F.2d 79, 86 (1st Cir. 1990) (citation omitted) (relied on by U.S. v.
13 Montrose Chem. Corp. of California, 50 F.3d 741, 746-48 (9th Cir.
14 1995)). "Substantive fairness introduces into the equation concepts of
15 corrective justice and accountability: a party should bear the cost of
16 the harm for which it is legally responsible." Id. at 87. In determining
17 whether a settlement is reasonable, courts look to whether the proposed
18 settlement will be effective in ensuring a cleanup of the property,
19 whether it satisfactorily compensates the public for the costs of
20 cleanup, and whether the settlement reflects the relative strengths of
21 the parties' bargaining positions. Id. at 89-90. Finally, determining
22 the fairness and reasonableness of the Sullivan Consent Decree requires
23 consideration of the extent to which it is consistent with the purposes
24 of CERCLA, two of which are: (1) to create a prompt and effective
25 response to hazardous waste problems; and (2) to ensure that the cost of
26 remedying the hazardous waste problem is paid for by those who caused
27 the problem. Id. at 90-91.

28 ///

1 Here, the parties have made the required showing that the
2 Sullivan Consent Decree is procedurally and substantively fair,
3 reasonable, and consistent with the purposes of CERCLA. The Sullivan
4 Consent Decree provides that "Turner and Sullivan shall each pay Fifty
5 Thousand Dollars (\$50,000) to the Department, and the State Agencies
6 shall collectively pay a total of Ten Thousand Dollars (\$10,000) to the
7 Department[.]" (Sullivan Consent Decree ¶ 7.1, ECF No. 1219.) "[T]he
8 total estimated response costs in the matter are: \$2,500,000 future
9 remedial action costs, \$764,603 past oversight costs and \$126,000 future
10 oversight costs, which total approximately \$3,390,603." (Mot. 9:16-18,
11 ECF No. 1216; Fiering Decl. Exs. B-C, ECF No. 1217.) The Sullivan
12 Consent Decree, along with the Maita Consent Decree which was filed on
13 July 20, 2011, and the 2010 Consent Decree, "will provide recovery of
14 over 84 [percent] of the total estimated response costs." (Mot. 9:18-20,
15 ECF No. 1216; ECF Nos. 1102, 1208.) Although this payment does not fully
16 compensate the Department for its oversight costs, the Department has
17 the ability to seek these costs from other non-settling parties and to
18 apply any unused funds obtained in the consent decrees to cover these
19 costs. Therefore, the Sullivan Consent Decree reflects a "reasonable
20 method of weighing comparative fault[.]" Id. at 88. Further, since the
21 Sullivan Consent Decree was the result of mediation through the Court's
22 Voluntary Dispute Resolution Program, it is procedurally fair. The
23 Sullivan Consent Decree also promptly and effectively responds to the
24 hazardous waste problem and ensures that the cost of remedying the
25 hazardous waste problem is paid for by those who caused it. Therefore,
26 the Sullivan Consent Decree is approved as procedurally and
27 substantively fair, reasonable, and consistent with the purposes of
28 CERCLA.

1 **III. MOTION FOR ORDER BARRING CONTRIBUTION CLAIMS AND**
2 **DECLARATION OF GOOD FAITH**

3 The settling parties also seek an order barring contribution
4 and indemnity claims for the "matters addressed" in the Sullivan Consent
5 Decree. (Mot. 11:1-17, ECF No. 1214-1.) CERCLA section 113(f) provides:

6 A person who has resolved liability to the United
7 States or a State in an administrative or
8 judicially approved settlement shall not be liable
9 for claims for contribution regarding matters
10 addressed in the settlement. Such settlement does
not discharge any of the other potentially liable
persons unless its terms so provide, but it reduces
the potential liability of the others by the amount
of the settlement.

11 42 U.S.C. § 9613(f) (2). Under this section, "[c]ontribution protection
12 is conferred on the settling parties at the time the settling parties
13 enter into the agreement." U.S. v. Colorado & E. R.R. Co., 50 F.3d 1530,
14 1538 (10th Cir. 1995). Therefore, the settling parties' request for an
15 order barring contribution and indemnity claims for the "matters
16 addressed" in the Sullivan Consent Decree is granted.

17 The settling parties also seek a judicial declaration that the
18 Sullivan Consent Decree constitutes a good faith settlement under
19 California Code of Civil Procedure section 877.6, which precludes claims
20 for contribution and indemnity. (Mot. 6:20-9:3, ECF No. 1214-1.) Section
21 877.6 of the California Code of Civil Procedure prescribes:

22 A determination by the court that the settlement
23 was made in good faith shall bar any other joint
24 tortfeasor from any further claims against the
25 settling tortfeasor or co-obligor for equitable
comparative contribution, or partial or comparative
indemnity, based on comparative negligence or
comparative fault.

26 Cal. Code Civ. P. § 877.6(c). Whether a settlement is made in "good
27 faith" within the meaning of section 877.6 is determined based on the
28 factors identified by the California Supreme Court in Tech-Bilt, Inc. v.

1 Woodward-Clyde & Assoc., 38 Cal. 3d 488 (1985), including: (i) a rough
2 approximation of plaintiff's total recovery and the settlor's
3 proportionate liability; (ii) the amount paid in settlement; (iii) the
4 allocation of settlement proceeds among plaintiffs; (iv) a recognition
5 that the settlor should pay less in settlement than he would if he were
6 found liable after trial; (v) the financial conditions and insurance
7 policy limits of settling defendants; and (vi) the existence of
8 collusion, fraud, or tortious conduct aimed to injure the interests of
9 non-settling defendants. Id. at 499.

10 Based on the Tech-Bilt factors, the Sullivan Consent Decree
11 qualifies as a good faith settlement within the meaning of section
12 877.6. "The first factor, an approximation of recovery and potential
13 liability, is the most important." AmeriPride Serv., Inc. v. Valley
14 Indust. Serv., Inc., Nos. CIV. S-00-113-LKK JFM, S-04-1494-LKK/JFM, 2007
15 WL 1946635, at *3 (E.D. Cal. July 2, 2007). "The settlement amount need
16 only be 'in the ballpark' [to satisfy this factor], with any party
17 challenging a settlement having the burden of establishing that it is so
18 far out of the ballpark that the equitable objectives of section 877 are
19 not satisfied." Id. Here, the Sullivan Consent Decree is within the
20 "ballpark" of a "rough approximation" of the Department's total recovery
21 and the settling parties' proportionate liability. Further, there is no
22 evidence that the settling parties engaged in collusion, fraud, or other
23 conduct seeking to impose an undue share of liability on the non-
24 settling parties. Accordingly, the Sullivan Consent Decree was reached
25 in good faith. Therefore, any claim against the settling parties "for
26 equitable comparative contribution, or partial or comparative indemnity,
27 based on comparative indemnity, based on comparative negligence, or
28


1 comparative fault" is barred by California Code of Civil Procedure
2 section 877.6.

3 **III. CONCLUSION**

4 For the stated reasons, it is ORDERED:

- 5 1. The Sullivan Consent Decree is approved as procedurally and
6 substantively fair, reasonable, and consistent with the purposes of
7 CERCLA.
- 8 2. Any claim for contribution or indemnity against the settling
9 parties for the "matters addressed" in the Sullivan Consent Decree
10 is barred by 42 U.S.C. § 9613(f).
- 11 3. The Sullivan Consent Decree was entered into in good faith within
12 the meaning of California Code of Civil Procedure section 877.6,
13 and any claim against the settling parties for contribution or
14 indemnity is barred by section 877.6.

15 Dated: July 20, 2011

16
17 
18 _____
19 GARLAND E. BURRELL, JR.
20 United States District Judge
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28